



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,339	03/29/2004	Brian Lee Lawrence	135476-1/YOD GERD:0088	2691
7590	01/10/2005		EXAMINER SUCHECKI, KRISTYNA	
Patrick S. Yoder FLETCHER YODER P.O. Box 692289 Houston, TX 77269-2289			ART UNIT 2882	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/812,339

Applicant(s)

LAWRENCE ET AL.

Examiner

Krystyna Suchecki

Art Unit

2882

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/01/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19-23, 25-27, 45-47 and 49 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sprangle (US 5,353,291).

3. Regarding Claims 1, 3-5, 15-17, 22, 23, 45 and 47, Sprangle teaches a system and method for generating X-rays, the system comprising: a high repetition rate laser (22) adapted to generate and direct high-energy optical pulses in a first direction in a laser cavity (56), wherein a plurality of mirrors are arranged in a ring configuration (Column 3, line 14); an isolator (48) located in the laser cavity for directing the optical pulses in the first direction; and a source of a pulsed electron beam (16) adapted to generate and direct the pulsed electron beam in a second direction opposite to the first direction in the laser cavity, the pulsed electron beam impacting photons in the optical pulses in the laser cavity to produce X-rays (18) in the second direction, wherein the high energy optical pulses comprise high repetition rate, mode-locked optical pulses (Column 4, line 47).

4. Regarding Claims 2 and 46, Sprangle teaches a system and method, further comprising a plurality of mirrors (36, 26, 28, 34) located in the laser cavity for confining the optical pulses within the laser cavity.

Art Unit: 2882

5. Regarding Claims 7, 19, 25 and 49, Sprangle teaches a system and method, further comprising an electro-optic cell (Column 4, lines 50-55) and a Brewster plate (36) located in the laser cavity for generating the high repetition rate, mode- locked optical pulses.
6. Regarding Claims 12, 20 and 26, Sprangle teaches a system, wherein the source of the pulsed electron beam is a radio frequency linear accelerator (16).
7. Regarding Claims 13, 21 and 27, Sprangle teaches a system, further comprising one or more magnets (24, 25) to direct the pulsed electron beam in the second direction in the laser cavity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 8-11 and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprangle in view of Erbert (US 6,760,356).
10. Regarding claims 8-11 and 50-51, Sprangle teaches system and method for generating X-rays having a stretching and compressing amplification component (42) to rejuvenate the circulating laser beam from a solid state laser (Column 4, lines 1-11 and 60).
11. Sprangle fails to teach particulars of the component such that it comprises a solid state laser rod, a Yb:YAG laser rod, a gating located in the laser cavity for temporally stretching the optical pulses or a grating located in the laser cavity for temporally compressing the optical pulses.

Art Unit: 2882

12. Erbert teaches an amplification system and method using a combination of a grating stretcher, a Yb:YAG laser rod and a grating compressor for providing a high average power signal (Column 2, lines 25-30) with the Yb:YAG additionally providing a long upper state storage time and low thermal loading (Column 3, lines 28-64).

13. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize an amplification system and method using a combination of a grating stretcher, a Yb:YAG laser rod and a grating compressor as taught by Erbert in the system of Sprangle for the benefit of providing a high average power signal (Erbert, Column 2, lines 25-30) with the Yb:YAG additionally providing a long upper state storage time and low thermal loading (Erbert, Column 3, lines 28-64). The combination would provide an additional solid state laser in the system, thereby increasing the amount of laser light for the electron beam to interact with in the system.

14. Claims 6, 18, 24 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprangle in view of Weingarten (US 2003/0174741).

15. Regarding Claims 6, 18 and 24, Sprangle teaches the use of a mode-locking device in an X-ray generation system and method above in order to regulate the occurrence of laser pulses (Column 4, lines 43-49)

16. Sprangle fails to teach an acousto-optic cell located in the laser cavity for generating the high repetition rate, mode-locked optical pulses.

17. Weingarten teaches that it is known in the art to use an acousto-optic modulator as an intracavity element to produce short, picosecond pulses (Paragraph 2).

Art Unit: 2882

18. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an acousto-optic cell located in the laser cavity as taught by Weingarten in the system and method for generating high repetition rate, mode-locked optical pulses of Sprangle, since the arrangement is established in the art for the generation of short pulses (Weingarten, Paragraph 2).

19. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprangle in view of Antonell (US 2001/0043667).

20. Regarding Claim 14, Sprangle teaches an X-ray beam (18) exiting a generation system through a window (54).

21. Sprangle is silent on further directional motion of the X-ray away from the laser cavity.

22. Antonell teaches X-ray diverting means (Figures 1-13) wherein multiple Bragg reflectors, in the form of plural crystals, collectively provide predictable diffraction angles for x-rays to propagate towards a sample (Paragraphs 6-9) for the benefit of providing parallel or convergent radiation for a variety of applications (Paragraph 2) from a common source (Paragraph 6).

23. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the Bragg reflectors of Antonell to direct X-rays in a pre-determined direction from the laser cavity of Sprangle for the benefits of providing parallel or convergent radiation for a variety of applications (Antonell, Paragraph 2) from a common source (Antonell, Paragraph 6).

Art Unit: 2882

24. Claims 28-30, 32-38 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprangle in view of Hartemann (US 6,724,782).

25. Regarding Claims 28, 29, 33-37 and 41-44, Sprangle teaches a system for generating X-rays, the system comprising: a mode-locked laser (Column 4, lines 43-49 and 59-63) adapted to generate and direct high-energy optical pulses in a first direction in a laser cavity having a ring configuration (Column 4, line 64- Column 5, line 1 and Figure 2); the laser cavity further comprising an isolator (48) for directing the optical pulses in the first direction; a source of a pulsed electron beam in an electron storage ring (164) overlapping the laser cavity, the electron storage ring adapted to circulate the pulsed electron beam in a second direction opposite to the first direction in the laser cavity, the electron beam impacting photons in the optical pulses in the laser cavity to produce X-rays in the second direction (Column 5, lines 31-61). The (storage ring) betatron (164) stores and circulates the electron beam and includes an amplifier to accelerate the electron beam circulating in the electron storage ring (Column 5, lines 57-60).

26. Sprangle fails to teach a source of a pulsed electron beam adapted to feed electron beam in an electron storage ring overlapping the laser cavity wherein the pulsed electron beam originates from a radio frequency linear accelerator and wherein the storage ring stores and circulates the electron beam, and includes an amplifier to accelerate the electron beam circulating in the electron storage ring, and the round trip circulation time of the electron beam in the electron storage ring is substantially equivalent to a round trip time of the optical pulses in the laser cavity.

27. Hartemann teaches a system for generating X-rays having a source (11) of a pulsed electron beam adapted to feed electron beam in an electron storage ring (12) overlapping a laser

Art Unit: 2882

cavity (26). Hartemeann's pulsed electron beam originates from a radio frequency linear accelerator system (11). The storage ring (12) stores and circulates the electron beam and includes an amplifier to accelerate the electron beam circulating in the electron storage ring (Column 4, lines 47-64). The round trip circulation time of the electron beam in the electron storage ring is substantially equivalent to a round trip time of the optical pulses in the laser cavity (Column 5, lines 4-9). Hartemann teaches the pulsed system feeding the storage ring for the benefits of system compactness and minimal jitter (Column 3, line 65- Column 4, line 12).

28. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the source of a pulsed electron beam (radio frequency linear accelerator system) adapted to feed electron beam in an electron storage ring as taught by Hartemann in the system of Sprangle in order to have a storage ring that stores and circulates the electron beam and includes an amplifier to accelerate the electron beam circulating in the electron storage ring (Column 4, lines 47-64) and that has a round trip circulation time of the electron beam in the electron storage ring is substantially equivalent to a round trip time of the optical pulses in a laser cavity (Column 5, lines 4-9) for the benefit of having an X-ray generation system that is compact and has minimal jitter (Hartemann, Column 3, line 65- Column 4, line 12).

29. Regarding Claim 29, Sprangle teaches a system, further comprising an isolator (48) located in the laser cavity for directing the optical pulses in the first direction.

30. Regarding Claims 30 and 38, Sprangle teaches a system, wherein the high energy optical pulses comprise high repetition rate, mode-locked optical pulses (Column 4, line 47).

Art Unit: 2882

31. Regarding Claim 32 and 40, Sprangle teaches a system, further comprising an electro-optic cell (Column 4, lines 50-55) and a Brewster plate (36) located in the laser cavity for generating the high repetition rate, mode- locked optical pulses.

Claims 31 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprangle in view Hartemann, as taught for claims 28 and 37 above, and further in view of Weingarten (US 2003/0174741).

32. Regarding Claims 31 and 39, Sprangle in view of Hartemann, as taught for Claims 28 and 37 above, teach the use of a mode-locking device in an X-ray generation system above in order to regulate the occurrence of laser pulses (Column 4, lines 43-49)

33. Sprangle in view of Hartemann fails to teach an acousto-optic cell located in the laser cavity for generating the high repetition rate, mode-locked optical pulses.

34. Weingarten teaches that it is known in the art to use an acousto-optic modulator as an intracavity element to produce short, picosecond pulses (Paragraph 2).

35. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an acousto-optic cell located in the laser cavity as taught by Weingarten in the system of Sprangle as modified by Hartemann for generating a high repetition rate, mode-locked optical pulses, since the arrangement is established in the art for the generation of short pulses (Weingarten, Paragraph 2).

Response to Arguments

36. Applicant's arguments filed 11/01/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Sprangle fails to teach the generation of laser light in a laser

Art Unit: 2882

cavity. However, Sprangle shows a laser cavity, as created by a mirror system (Figure 1, items 26, 28, 34 and 36). Contrary to Applicant's assertions, all four mirrors are required to create a ring resonator (Column 3, lines 19-27). The exclusion of two mirrors from a vacuum system does not negate the presence of a ring resonator. The cavity is created for the purpose of circulating laser light from a source (22) for interaction with an electron beam. Additional laser light is generated within the laser cavity by the recycler or low gain amplifier (42). In this way, laser light is generated in a laser cavity. The exclusion of two mirrors from the electron beam interaction chamber does not destroy the presence of a laser cavity created by four mirrors. Synchronization means ensures the generated light is at the correct high repetition rate (Sprangle, Column 4, lines 43-51).

37. Additionally, Applicant fails to claim a high repetition rate laser in a laser cavity. The claims are written broadly enough to require only high-energy optical pulses to be generated and directed in a first direction in a laser cavity. Device 42 of Sprangle meets this limitation under a first interpretation stated above. Laser 22 of Sprangle meets the requirement under a second interpretation, where laser 22 causes the generation and direction of laser light in a cavity.

38. The rejections under 35 USC 103 with Sprangle in view of Erberts, Weingarten, Antonell and Hartemann are upheld. Applicant has not contended that the secondary references fail to teach the claim limitations to which they were applied. Since the secondary references were not relied upon to teach the generation of optical pulses in a laser cavity, the references are considered properly applied for the limitations relied upon.

Conclusion

39. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krystyna Suchecki whose telephone number is (571) 272-2495. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5.

41. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

42. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NO

Craig E Church

Craig E. Church
Primary Examiner